

TREE & LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT
AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING NOTES
JANUARY, 18, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

Committee Members in Attendance: Kol Medina, Mack Pearl, Jon Quitslund, Sarah Blossom

COBI Staff: Jennifer Sutton, Barry Loveless, Janelle Hitch, Josh Machen

Public: Kelsey Laughlin, Peter Perry and Charles Schmid

Item 1: Notes from the meetings on Nov. 30 and Dec. 21, 2016, were approved as distributed. Item 2: The meeting agenda was reviewed and approved.

Item 3: Public comment. Kelsey Laughlin said that she has conferred with other professionals whose work will be impacted by LID regulations, and she is concerned about the costs that will be added to small-scale building projects if elaborate site assessment requirements are imposed with the current low thresholds. She had attended a Council meeting to make a comment and was referred to the Ad Hoc Committee.

Item 4 A: Planning and Public Works staff spoke about the current status of work on the Site Assessment and Development Permit (BIMC 15.19). Kol asked how the Ad Hoc Committee could help in the completion of Phase I and the move into Phase II of LID policies.

Discussion in the rest of the meeting dealt mostly with issues arising from an unfinished draft of BIMC 15.19. The chapter had been introduced to the Council and referred back to staff for further work. Jon had seen and studied the draft, and was surprised that (A) it covered only development on single-family residential lots, and (B) it did not describe either the rationale for a site assessment or the kinds of professional work and analysis of the site that would be required before the permit can be issued.

Josh sought to explain why it's too complicated to cover everything at this point, in this chapter. Development on individual residential lots does not now require a site assessment, while for other projects involving a preapplication conference, site assessment is already an important part of the process. Josh thought that developing standards and procedures fully consistent with LID principles would take several months, and it would be a mistake to delay completion of BIMC 15.19.

Jennifer said that plans were in the works for an 'outreach' meeting at the end of January to introduce LID regulations to interested parties (in geotech, environmental, design, building, and real estate fields). The intent of staff is to take the BIMC chapter to the Council by the middle of February.

Kol asked the members of the committee what they thought. Jon's response was the most emphatic: LID principles and best practices need to be explained and justified, and they should not be implemented gradually, but with some sense of urgency. Peter Perry, representing the interests of the DRB, emphasized that the DRB is eager to work with property owners and developers as early as possible, prior to the formation of ideas about a building, to ensure that new development will be harmonious with the 'lay of the land' and protective of aquifers and Puget Sound.

Earlier in the meeting, Barry had expressed a concern that with different parties' interests in managing the process and results of development, we were heading toward a very time-consuming, confusing, and expensive series of hurdles or obstacles. Among the participants in the discussion, there were divergent views of the City's regulatory and planning authority.

The 90-minute meeting ended without taking account of the several parts of Phase II in the LID work plan, and without discussing the policy questions related to revision of BIMC 16.18 and 16.22. (Mack wanted to connect policies in 16.22 with the site assessment goals and processes in 15.19.)

Kol asked Jennifer if it would be possible to develop a schedule or calendar for getting things done. Jon told Jennifer and Janelle that he would like to work on revising the Purpose statement for the Site Assessment and Development Permits chapter (15.19).

The next meeting will be on Feb. 1.

Notes Approved: February 1, 2017